UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT. (S) CARRIOR DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS -3 P 3: 10

	- Company of	
PATRICK LONGLEY, Plaintiff		thich (Assi)
) Civil Action	
V.)	RECEIPT #
BUCHANAN MARINE LP, Defendant) No	AMOUNT & NA
)	SUMMONS ISSUE YE
) 060	LOCAL RULE 4, 1
	MAGISTRATE JUDGE KINC	WAIVER FORM
		MCF ISSUED_
		BY DPTY, CLE TOM
		DATE 12 WW

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Now comes the Plaintiff in the above-entitled matter and for his complaint states:

General Factual Allegations

- The Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, is a resident of Swansea, County of Bristol, 1. Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- 2. The Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, is a corporation, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Connecticut.
- On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, was doing 3. business within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- During the year 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, was doing business 4. within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- On or about July 25, 2004, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, was employed by the 5. Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP.
 - On or about July 25, 2004, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, was employed by the 6.

Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, as a seaman, and a member of the crew of the BUCHANAN 18.

- 7. On or about July 25, 2004, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, was employed by the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, as a seaman, and a member of the crew of the TUG DORY BARKER.
- 8. On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, owned the BUCHANAN 18.
- 9. On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, owned the TUG DORY BARKER.
- 10. The Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, chartered the BUCHANAN 18 from some other person or entity such that on or about July 25, 2004 the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP was the owner pro hac vice of the BUCHANAN 18.
- 11. The Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, chartered the TUG DORY BARKER from some other person or entity such that on or about July 25, 2004 the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP was the owner pro hac vice of the TUG DORY BARKER.
- 12. On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, operated the BUCHANAN 18.
- 13. On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, operated the TUG DORY BARKER.
- 14. On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, or the Defendant's agents, servants, and/or employees, controlled the BUCHANAN 18.
 - 15. On or about July 25, 2004, the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, or the

Defendant's agents, servants, and/or employees, controlled the TUG DORY BARKER.

- 16. On or about July 25, 2004, the BUCHANAN 18 was in navigable waters.
- 17. On or about July 25, 2004, the TUG DORY BARKER was in navigable waters.
- 18. On or about July 25, 2004, while in the in the performance of his duties in the service of the BUCHANAN 18 and TUG DORY BARKER, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, sustained personal injuries.
- 19. Prior to and at the time he sustained the above-mentioned personal injuries, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, was exercising due care.

Jurisdiction

- 20. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to The Merchant Marine Act of 1920, commonly called the Jones Act, 46 U.S.C., §688 et. seq.
- 21. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331, 28 U.S.C. §1332, and 28 U.S.C. §1333.

COUNT I

Patrick Longley v. Buchanan Marine LP

(JONES ACT NEGLIGENCE)

- 22. The Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, reiterates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 21 above.
- 23. The personal injuries sustained by the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, were not caused by any fault on his part but were caused by the negligence of the Defendant, its agents, servants and/or employees.
 - 24. As a result of said injuries, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, has suffered pain of

body and anguish of mind, lost time from his usual work and pursuits, incurred medical expenses, and has sustained and will sustain other damages as will be shown at trial.

25. This cause of action is brought under the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, commonly called the Jones Act.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, demands judgment against the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, in the amount of FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$500,000.00) together with interest and costs.

COUNT II

Patrick Longley v. Buchanan Marine LP

(GENERAL MARITIME LAW - UNSEAWORTHINESS)

- 26. The Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, reiterates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 21 above.
- 27. The personal injuries sustained by the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, were due to no fault of his, but were caused by the Unseaworthiness of the BUCHANAN 18.
- 28. The personal injuries sustained by the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, were due to no fault of his, but were caused by the Unseaworthiness of the TUG DORY BARKER.
- As a result of said injuries, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley has, suffered pain of 29. body and anguish of mind, lost time from his usual work and pursuits, incurred medical expenses, and has sustained and will sustain other damages as will be shown at trial.
- 30. This cause of action is brought under the General Maritime Law for Unseaworthiness and is for the same cause of action as Count I.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, demands judgment against the Defendant,

Buchanan Marine LP, in the amount of FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$500,000.00) together with interest and costs.

COUNT III

Patrick Longley v. Buchanan Marine LP

(GENERAL MARITIME LAW - MAINTENANCE and CURE)

- 31. The Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, reiterates all of the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 21 above.
- 32. As a result of the personal injuries described in paragraph 18 above, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for his maintenance and cure.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, demands judgment against the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, in the amount of TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$200,000.00) for maintenance and cure, together with costs and interest.

COUNT IV

Patrick Longley vs. Buchanan Marine LP

(GENERAL MARITIME LAW/JONES ACT - INTENTIONAL/NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE and CURE)

- 33. The Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, reiterates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 21 above.
- 34. As a result of the personal injuries described in paragraph 18 above, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for his maintenance and cure.
 - 35. The Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, has made demand upon the Defendant, Buchanan

Marine LP, for the provision of maintenance and cure.

36. The Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, has negligently, willfully, arbitrarily, and/or unreasonably failed to provide the Plaintiff with maintenance and cure in a timely and adequate manner.

37. As a result of the Defendant's failure to provide the Plaintiff maintenance and cure, the Plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain damages, including without limitation, pain of body and anguish of mind, lost time from his usual work and pursuits, medical and hospital expenses, attorneys fees, and has sustained and will sustain other damages as will be shown at trial.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, demands judgment against the Defendant, Buchanan Marine LP, in the amount of FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$400,000.00) as compensatory damages for failure to pay maintenance and cure, together with costs, interest, and reasonable attorneys fees.

> PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL ISSUES RAISED IN COUNTS, I, II, III AND IV.

> > Respectfully submitted for the the Plaintiff, Patrick Longley, by his attorney,

Carolyn M. Latti, BBO 567394 David F. Anderson, BBO 560994

Latti & Anderson LLP 30-31 Union Wharf Boston, MA 02109 (617) 523-1000

Dated: / 2 - 2 - 6 - 4

%JS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM)

I. (Patrick Long b) County of Residence of		Bristol FF CASES)		County of Resid	NTS an Marine LP dence of First Lis (IN U.S. PL/	y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y	150 -3 P 3 10 SES ONLY)
	c) Attomey's (Firm Nam Carolyn M. I 30-31 Union BASIS OF JURISD	atti,BBO567394, La Wharf, Boston, MA	tti & Anderson I I	000 III. CITI	Attorneys (If K	now1)		USE THE LOCATION OF THE S(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
	1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity	n iment Not a Party) zenship of Parties	Citizen Citizen	P	TF DEF 1 To Ir	of Business neorporated an of Business	and One Box for Defendant) PIF DEF Principal Place 4 4 4 In This State nd Principal Place 5 5 5 In Another State
ĪV.	NATURE OF SUIT				en Country		oreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
1	10 Insurance 20 Marine 30 Miller Act 40 Negotiable Instrument 50 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 51 Medicare Act 52 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 53 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 50 Stockholders' Suits 50 Stockholders' Suits 50 Other Contract 25 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 10 Land Condemnation 20 Force losure 30 Rent Lease & Ejectment 40 Torts to Land 15 Tort Product Liability 50 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Mctor Vehicle 355 Mctor Vehicle product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Weifare 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIO 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 536 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	1 610 620 625 626 625 640 626 62	LABOR air Labor Standards vet abor/Mgmt, Relations abor/Mgmt, Reporting Disclosure Act ailway Labor Act ther Labor Litigation	## 422 Appeal 2 ## 423 Withdraw 28 USC 1 ## 920 Copyright ## 830 Patent ## 840 Trademar ## 861 HIA (139, 148, 148, 148, 148, 148, 148, 148, 148	Nal SUSC 158 Nal ST Nation of State of	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 70 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Energy Allocation Act 894 Energy Allocation Act 19 90 0 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 3890 Other Statutory Actions
☑ 1 /I. (Original 2 Rer	noved from 3 R	emanded from ppellate Court tre under which you are film;		or 5 another (specify) <u> </u>	6 Multidistri Litigation	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment
/II. /III.	REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: RELATED CASE(S IF ANY	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P (See instructions):	IS A CLASS ACTION 23 JUDGE	DEMA	*D*\$1,100,000.0	0 СНЕСІ	DEMAND:	f demanded in complaint: Yes No
1	12-2-06		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY OF REC		on/	HF)	Luon

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	Categor	y in wh	nich the case belone	gs based up	on the numbered natur	e of suit code	listed on the		<u> </u>
	local rui	e 40.1(a	a)(1)).			o o our code	iisted on the	civil cover s	heet. (See
	<u></u>	i.	160, 410, 470, F	R.23, REGAR	RDLESS OF NATURE O	F SUIT.			
	<u></u>	II.	195, 368, 400,	440, 441-444	4, 540, 550, 555, 625, 7 340*, 850, 890, 892-894	10 720 700	*Also co	mplete AO	I20 or AO 121 k or copyright c
		III,	110, 120, 130, 315, 320, 330, 3 380, 385, 450, 8	J4U, J45, 35	0, 210, 230, 240, 245, 2 0, 355, 360, 362, 365, 3	290, 310, 370, 371,	·	,	k or copyright c
	<u>Marana</u>	IV.	220, 422, 423, 4 690, 810, 861-8	430, 460, 51(165, 870, 871	0, 530, 610, 620, 630, 6 , 875, 900.	40, 650, 660 <u>,</u>			
	<u></u> i	V.	150, 152, 153.						
	this distric	t pleas	r, if any, of related on se indicate the title	cases. (See and number	local rule 40.1(g)). If m of the first filed case in	ore than one p	prior related c	ase has bee	n filed in
	Has a prio	r actio	n between the same	e parties and	d based on the same c	aim ever been	filed in this o	ourt?	
)					istitutionality of an act		r1	go Mannana ;	? (See
	If so, is the	U.S.A.	. or an officer, agen	t or employe	e of the U.S. a party?	YES	NO NO		
	Is this case	Forming				YES	NO	~	
		requi	ed to be neard and	determined	by a district court of th	ree judges pui	rsuant to title	28 USC §22	84?
						YES	NO NO		
	Do <u>all</u> of the Massachus 40.1(d)).	etts ("g	s in this action, ex governmental agend	cluding gove cies"), resid	ernmental agencies of ling in Massachusetts	the united stat reside in the s	es and the Co ame division	mmonwealt ? - (See Loc	h of al Rule
	A.		If yes, in which di	vision do <u>all</u>	of the non-governmen	YES tal parties resi	NO lde?	~	
			Eastern Division		Central Division		Western		
	В.		If no, in which divi agencies, residing	ision do the i	majority of the plaintiff husetts reside?	s or the only p	arties, exclud	ing governn	ental
			Eastern Division		Central Division	Anthony (grand)	Western		W 107 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
if y	filing a Not es, submit a	ice of F separ	Removal - are there ate sheet identifyin	any motions g the motion	s pending in the state c ns)	ourt requiring t	the attention o	of this Court	? (If
	TYPE OR PF	RINT)				YES	NO		
SE		Caral	yn M. Latti, Latti	: 0 A m al a	on IID				
	Y'S NAME _	Caro	yn w. Latti, Latti	o Anders	ON LLP				